REMARKS

Claims 1, 16, 28, 36-37, 40-41, 46, 48-49 and 53-55 have been amended. Claim 8 has been cancelled. No new matter has been added.

Claim Objections

Claim 49 was objected to for informalities. In response, claim 49 has been amended to depend from claim 48. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this claim and withdrawal of the objection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, this rejection is moot in view of the amendments to these claims, as indicated above. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of these claims and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 28, 36-37 and 40-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for being indefinite. In response, indefinite language has been corrected in these claims, as indicated above, to comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of these claims and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Copperman (US 6,711,585 B1). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method of implementing and using a federated system on a node in a computing environment and recites the following limitations:

defining a plurality of data sources on the node, each data source being associated with a taxonomy;

establishing a taxonomy view at the node by taking a snapshot of the taxonomy of at least one of the plurality of data sources defined on the node;

creating one or more mappings between the taxonomy view at the node and the taxonomy of at least one of the plurality of data sources; and

accessing the plurality of data sources via the taxonomy view.

Applicants respectfully submit that Copperman does not disclose such limitations.

Copperman is directed to a system and method for organizing and retrieving information through the use of taxonomies, a document classifier and an autocontextualization system.

Importantly, with respect to taxonomies, documents stored in a organization and retrieval subsystem are classified into a predetermined number of taxonomies through a process called autocontextualization. In operation, the documents are transformed from clear text into a structured record (knowledge container) automatically constructed indexes (tags) to help identify when the structured record is an appropriate response to a particular query. An automatic term extractor creates a list of terms that are indicative of the subject matter contained in the documents, and then a subject matter expert identifies the terms that are relevant to the taxonomies. A term analysis system assigns the relevant terms to one or more taxonomies, and a suitable algorithm is then used to determine the relatedness (weight) between each list of terms and its associated taxonomy. The system then clusters documents for each taxonomy in accordance with the weights ascribed to the terms in the taxonomy's list and a directed acyclic graph (DAG) structure is created. *See Copperman, col. 2, lines 13-31.*

Accordingly, Copperman transforms clear text into a structured record and creates a list of terms that are indicative of the subject matter contained in the documents. Copperman does not directly create a taxonomy view of the structured record or the documents. After creating the list of terms indicative of the subject matter contained in the documents, Copperman specifically discloses that a subject matter expert then identifies the terms that are relevant to the taxonomies. Hence, Copperman does not disclose establishing a taxonomy view by taking a snapshot of the taxonomy, as required by the present claims.

In contrast to Copperman, independent claim 1 requires defining a plurality of data sources on the node, wherein each data source is associated with a taxonomy, establishing a taxonomy view at the node by taking a snapshot of the taxonomy of at least one of the plurality of data sources defined on the node, creating one or more mappings between the taxonomy view at the node and the taxonomy of at least one of the plurality of data sources, and accessing the

plurality of data sources via the taxonomy view. Support for these limitations of claim 1 can be found throughout the Applicants' specification, for example, in paragraphs 52 and 68.

Copperman does not disclose these limitations of the present claims. As noted above, Copperman explicitly fails to disclose establishing a taxonomy view at the node by taking a snapshot of the taxonomy of at least one of the plurality of data sources defined on the node.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by the cited Copperman reference.

For at least these same reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 54 and 55, as amended, are likewise not anticipated by the cited Copperman reference.

Moreover, to further distinguish the present claims over the cited Copperman reference, claims 16, 40 and 46 have been amended in independent form to include the subject matter of base claim 1 and any intervening claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that Copperman does not disclose the following limitations of claims 16, 40 and 46, and the Action fails to directly address the limitations of these claims.

Independent claim 16 recites the following limitations:

defining a plurality of data sources on the node, each data source being associated with a taxonomy having one or more available objects;

establishing a taxonomy view having one or more objects at the node;

creating one or more mappings between each available object in the taxonomy of the at least one data source and one or more objects in the taxonomy view of the node matching the available data source object;

accessing the plurality of data sources via the taxonomy view; and

maintaining one or more lists of one or more aliases for the one or more objects in the taxonomy view of the node, wherein at least one of the one or more mappings between the one or more available objects in the taxonomy of the at least one data source and the one or more objects in the taxonomy view of the node is created using the one or more lists.

Applicants respectfully assert that Copperman does not disclose the limitations of claim 16. Particularly, Copperman explicitly fails to disclose, "maintaining one or more lists of one or more aliases for the one or more objects in the taxonomy view of the node, wherein at least one

of the one or more mappings between the one or more available objects in the taxonomy of the at least one data source and the one or more objects in the taxonomy view of the node is created using the one or more lists".

Independent claim 40 recites the following limitations:

defining a plurality of data sources on the node, each data source being associated with a taxonomy;

establishing a taxonomy view at the node;

creating one or more mappings between the taxonomy view at the node and the taxonomy of at least one of the plurality of data sources;

accessing the plurality of data sources via the taxonomy view; and

controlling access to one or more of the plurality of data sources by regulating presentation of content from the one or more data sources,

wherein one or more filters or business rules are used to regulate the presentation of the content from the one or more data source.

Applicants respectfully assert that Copperman does not disclose the limitations of claim 40. Particularly, Copperman explicitly fails to disclose, "wherein one or more filters or business rules are used to regulate the presentation of the content from the one or more data source".

Independent claim 46 recites the following limitations:

defining a plurality of data sources on the node, each data source being associated with a taxonomy;

establishing a taxonomy view at the node;

creating one or more mappings between the taxonomy view at the node and the taxonomy of at least one of the plurality of data sources;

accessing the plurality of data sources via the taxonomy view; and

controlling access to one or more of the plurality of data sources by altering content from the one or more data sources,

wherein one or more business rules are used to alter the content from the one or more data sources.

Applicants respectfully assert that Copperman does not disclose the limitations of claim 46. Particularly, Copperman explicitly fails to disclose, "wherein one or more business rules are used to alter the content from the one or more data sources".

It is respectfully submitted that claims 16, 40 and 46 are not anticipated by the cited Copperman reference.

Since the Action does not directly address the limitations of claims 16, 40 and 46, reconsideration of these claims is respectfully requested.

Moreover, since claims 2-15, 17-39, 41-45 and 47-53 depend from one of independent claims 1, 16, 40 and 46, these dependent claims are allowable over the cited Copperman reference for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, all claims are believed allowable, and an allowance of the claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Bingham McCutchen's Deposit Account No. **50-2518,** referencing billing number **7035172003**. The Commissioner is authorized to credit any overpayment or to charge any underpayment to Bingham McCutchen's Deposit Account No. **50-2518,** referencing billing number **7035172003**.

Respectfully submitted,
BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP

Date: June 29, 2006

By: _____
Jeffrey A. Hopkins
Registration No. 53,034

Three Embarcadero Center, Suite 1800
San Francisco, California 94111
Los Angeles, CA 90071-3106
Telephone: (213) 680-6400
Telefax: (213) 680-6499